

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 3-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 3-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,857,212 issued to *Van De Vanter*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,627,948 issued to *Fukunaga*. Claims 22, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Multi-Edit Text Editor Version 8.0 (hereinafter *Multi-Edit*). Claims 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Multi-Edit* in view of WordPerfect for Windows version 6.1. Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be reconsidered in light of the arguments presented below.

Claim 1 recites, "if the location of the cursor is positioned over existing text, then collecting context information associated with the existing text; otherwise, collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor..."

Neither *Van De Vanter*, *Fukunaga*, or any combination thereof teach the limitation recited in Applicant's Claim 1. Page 15 of the Office Action states that "*Fukunaga* teaches collecting contextual formatting information of text lines proximate to a cursor position not located over text." However, as shown in Figure 4 of *Fukunaga* and the accompanying text in column 3, lines 64-67 and column 4, lines 1-10, the collection of context information does not occur when the cursor is not located over existing text. Specifically, "the format of the 3rd and 8th lines is different from that of the remaining lines... When the cursor return symbol is referred to, it is seen that input operation is performed in accordance with the format 308 up to the 8th line, and then in accordance with the format 301 at the 9th line and thereafter. In this manner,...the format of sentence display can be changed for each line."

Changing the format of a sentence display is different from the limitations recited in Applicant's Claim 1, namely, "if the location of the cursor is [not] positioned over existing text,...collecting context information associated with existing text that is proximate to the location of the cursor." Thus, *Fukunaga* does not anticipate nor make obvious Applicant's Claim 1. Applicant therefore submits that Claim 1, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

App. No. 09/098,366
Amendment dated February 19, 2004
Reply to final Office action of December 19, 2003

Claims 9, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 22, include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, independent Claims 9, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 22 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 2-8, 11-13, 16-20, and 23-28 are dependent on allowable base claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 10, 15 and 22 are allowable.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, pending Claims 1 and 3-28 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons stated above and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicant at the telephone number provided below.

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.




Joshua W. Korvet
Registration No. 51,894
Direct Line: 206.342.6257

JJF/ab